PHILIP MORRIS
MANAGEMENT CORP.

CHARLES E. B. GLENN
SENIOR PATENT COUNSEL

P. O. BOX 26583, RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23261-6583
4201 COMMERCE ROAD, DOOR 17, RICHMOND VA 23234

PHONE (804) 274-2045
FAX (804) 274-4780

December 6, 1993

VIA FACSIMILE

Antony Smith, M.A.
Reddie & Grose
16 Theobalds Road
London WCIX 8PL England

Re: PM 1522 II - FOREIGN FILING
Reddie & Grose: 34936

Dear Antony:

Thank you very much for your telecommunicated letters dated November 29 and 30, 1993, in connection with the above-identified applications.

Please consider the following matters:

(a) referring to your letter of November 29, claims 1 (at line 14) and 2 (at line 9), and the changes to page 5 of the specification recite in effect compaction "in excess of 10 pounds per cubic foot". Claim 3 recites a range which includes 10. Please consider whether we could make the specification and claim 1 and 2 more clearly inclusive of 10;

(b) claim 11 relates to flow-through cooling. The preferred flow-through cooling for SCI is at a pressure between 200 to 300 psig, more preferably 200 to 250 psig. I propose that claim 11 recite 200 to 250 psig instead of 250 to 500 psig (please note how conveniently claim 11 depends from claim 8, which recites cooling at "500 psig or below". The 200-250 cooling pressure, together with the maximum pressure of claim 10 fairly well defines the most preferred operating conditions for SCI. The higher maximum pressures shortens soak time;

(c) referring to your telecommunication on November 30, 1993, you listed

2028589671

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/zjpj0000

U.S. claims that lacked foreign counterparts. May I urge the return of some of the time-oriented claims like claims 75 (perhaps concluding with the additional phrase, ", most preferably, approximately 100 seconds") and claims 77 and 78 (but with dependency to claim 75 instead of claim 76). Can we add support at or about page 45 of the U.S. specification for any numerical recitation that originally appeared only in those U.S. claims as filed. Regarding U.S. claim 66 (concerning uniformity), it might provide a further distinction over the prior art;

(d) newly proposed claim 28 at line 3 should recite 10 pounds per cubic foot instead of "1016 cu. ft"; and

(e) claim 33's recitation of total volume of the vessel should be adjusted in view of the volumes mentioned in my telecommunication of December 3, 1993.

I also enclose a marked-up page 3 of your telefax of November 29, 1993, indicating an editorial change, which may prove to difficult to implement, but would emphasize that Table 5 refers to mechanically compacted tobacco.

Please do not hesitate to call regarding the above. Items (a) and (b) are considered the more important.

Thank you for your prompt, extensive and appreciated efforts on these applications.

Very truly yours,

Charles E. B. Glenn

/drs

2028589672

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/zjpj0000